It is likely the case that the creation of "premium" channels of internet traffic will create a very convenient user-internet-experience at home for select content. For example, I could watch a movie on demand via these "premium" channels of broadband internet.

I can remember a time when webpages loaded so slowly, that you could go and get a cup of coffee while you waited for your page to load. This was true of everyone's internet, because the "last mile" was so slow.

Now it is the case that I barely have the tolerance to wait 3-5 seconds for a webpage to load. This is the result of me becoming accustomed to faster speeds.

With the introduction of these "premium" channels of broadband internet, how long will it be, before the average internet user has no tolerance to wait more than a half-second for a webpage to load?

I think it will take 2-3 years. Within 2-3 years no website, that isn't paying for premium broadband internet access, will be able to maintain a respectable presence on the web.

The question doesn't seem to be whether or not we should constantly improve our broadband infrastructure, the how it will be billed. If I want access to "premium" content, then I should have the option to pay or not pay to have access to it.   If broadband companies really cared about consumer interest and demand-driven economics, they would market this access to consumers. If consumers don't want it, then it should be a dead-issue.

The question isn't even so much about internet freedom, so much as internet control. Leave control in the hands of consumers. We can decide if we want to pay for "premium" broadband channels for access to "premium" content.

What happens when all of our individual web presences disappear into an oblivion of obsolesence, as an oligopoly is formed between broadband providers and content providers? If we really need this

infrastructure, why not let us all pay for it, and own it, creating a public utility instead? In France everyone has free phone service, because they invested as a public into their own infrastructure. Isn't that supposed to be the role of government.. to coordinate the resources and interests of the people?

Until now, I've accepted that an important part of our infrastructure belongs to private enterprise, because it has never become problematic.. until now.. it's as though they feel entitled to the internet.. they are no longer serving public interest, they are taking the internet hostage, insofar as they want to control what content we are likely to have easy access to.

It already costs money to maintain a presence on the internet. There is already a billing model to bill for internet usage on both ends of the pipe (server and user). Sure, they could make a bigger better internet if they could target profitable businesses and charge them more money, creating a competitive internet advantage that they hold a monopoly over.. but that hurts businesses, it hurts users like me, all so they can make more money.

Why can't they just invest their money into something else? Why do their resources and influences entitle them to buy the internet? If they really want to create a new infrastructure, why can't they use something else? Can't they make a seperate network for exclusive content? I think they don't want to do that because no one would pay for it. If I want to watch movies on demand, I can already pay for that on cable or satellite TV. They already have an alternative network to use that has plenty of bandwidth.. it is perfectly usable and deliver high quality video all the time.

They want to use the internet because the internet is competing with their cable and satellite tv services.. their cable and satellite TV revenues are dwindling because we can find content online to entertain us.. and they want to maintain proprietorship and control over our viewing experiences.

We've seen what this does to content delivery already.. we've seen how expensive it is for anyone to communicate via television, we've

seen newsmedia consolidate and barriers to entry created throughout that entire industry. Why should we let them do that to our internet? Our government should be for the people, and the people love the internet, and it's about to be auctioned off to the same people we'd hoped to escape by turning to the internet to communicate and be entertained.

Alot of us don't want cable tv or satellite tv, we don't want the limited/controlled content, we don't want to pay their fees, and we don't want them taking our internet away, effectively removing our only viable means of escaping their brainwashing control over the public dialogue.

..and some of us would like to maintain a small webpresence that people will enjoy, without paying rediculous fees to be accessible (in a manner that is easy to access (ie. not weighted down by user-intolerable load-times).

I don't know for sure what the right answer is, but I know what the right result is. Please ensure that, whatever you decide, it results in a fair and balanced internet for everyone like the one we have come to enjoy for so long, and does not make our eyes torpid and plug them back in to a 'boobtube'.